Lesson 18 - Ascertaining The Human Dietetic Character, Part I

- 1. Prologue
- 2. Necessity Of Different Approaches To Nutritional Science
- 3. Understanding The Role Of Foods In Nutrition
- 4. Edibility Of Foods
- 5. Other Food Qualities
- 6. Summary Of Criteria Relative To Goodness
- 7. Ratings Of Generally Available Foods
- 8. Questions About The Lesson
- Article #1: Are We Vegetarians Or Fruitarians?
- Article #2: Research Yields Bombshell Of A Surprise!
- Article #3: Are We Meat Eaters?
- Article #4: Are We Milk Drinkers?
- Article #5: Are We Grain Eeaters?

1. Prologue

1.1 Human Anatomy, Physiology and Psychology Evidence Our Dietary Nature

The next two lessons are complementary in that both endeavor to establish, beyond refutation or doubt, all the particulars of human dietetic character. Once you're aware of correct dietary fare you'll be able to render one of the greatest services possible in America today! You'll be able to teach your clients how to eat for health rather than for disease, suffering and early death, that is now so commonplace in America.

In no area of our living regimes do we transgress our biological mandate as grievously as in the matter of diet. If our correct diet is fruitarian fare, then America consumes less than 10% of its correct dietary. Since the bulk of America's fruit is consumed by less than 25% of our populace, it should come as no surprise that there is such a great preponderance of disease amongst us.

In sallying forth into the world to bring the message of healthful living to others, you must be armed to the hilt with the knowledge to substantiate the truths you've learned. Moreover, you must understand the principles so well that you can readily adduce the truth for anyone who approaches you from some esoteric aspect of diet.

People are very little impressed by facts, unfortunately. Nevertheless, you should be cognizant of the facts! You should also learn emotional approaches which have a profound and abiding effect upon the client. Remember that the nature of your emotional approaches should be gentle, not hostile. Remain alert to the emotional state of your client. Help the client to remain comfortable by addressing him/her as a spectator to third party practice rather than as a guilty participant.

In the latter part of this lesson, some emotional approaches are suggested. Should you wish to impress your client with the correctness of the dietary you will guide him or her to, you might embody the

emotional approach in a narrative around your own experiences with others. Most Americans have addictions to pathogenic fare, i.e., cooked and fried dishes, condiments, fermented foods, etc. Americans are "hooked" on so many abominable dietary practices that we can marvel only that they survive as well as they do.

Today's "nutritionists" are subservient to the "basic four" food concepts. While this concept may look good on paper, it is a disaster in practice, because most of America's health problems stem largely from its observance. According to these nutritionists, we do not have any fixed dietary as have most animals in nature. Rather, humans are considered to be some sort of omnivorous creature above all the laws of nature. Many assert we have definite carnivorous leanings. Quite a few nutrition experts have termed our incisor teeth "fangs," in defense of the erroneous position that humans are meat eaters.

To term our incisor teeth fangs or even to liken them to Tangs is an outrage even to the most superficial observer.

Humans are well-equipped in all their anatomical features to gather fruits, but most unsuited to capture animals and rend them. Fangs and pointed teeth that penetrate and kill, rip and tear are a feature of all carnivores except birds.

Let's put this matter of human carnivorism on a personal level. Can you picture yourself quietly stalking a rabbit and pouncing upon it? If it should slip away, can you picture yourself exploding with a blinding burst of speed that may be 30 to 50 miles per hour for the short distance needed to overtake your prey? Can you picture yourself catching the rabbit in your mouth, and then sinking your fangs deeply into its vitals, crushing and killing it? Can you picture yourself ripping the animal to shreds and swallowing it in bloody bits and chunks without thorough mastication? Can you savor the animal's blood, guts, bones and organs? If you cannot carry out this practice with gusto and delight, you are not of a meat-eating disposition.

You must admit that we are not anatomically equipped as carnivores. You must also admit that the idea of attacking, killing and rending animals on the spot does not appeal to humans psychologically—we are not natural killers. What most of us do not realize is that we are not only psychologically but also physiologically unsuited to utilizing meat as a food.

When a natural carnivore swallows hunks of carrion unchewed, the flesh is digested in the stomach of the carnivore with ease and facility. Should we swallow large hunks of flesh without chewing, we'd digest very little of it before putrefaction set in. This putrefactive material would cause us many problems until it could be expelled from the intestinal tract. Why does a carnivore so readily digest something we can handle almost not at all?

Flesh is a proteinaceous food that is digested in an acid medium. Humans, relative to carnivores, secrete a very weak hydrochloric acid and little of the protein-splitting enzyme, pepsin. Carnivorous animals have a concentration of these flesh-digesting media 1100% greater than humans! Should a lion swallow your hand whole he would quite readily digest it. Should a human do the same thing, I leave to your imagination what would happen. Digestion is among the things that wouldn't happen!

There are hundreds of anatomical features that we humans have which place us among frugivorous animals. We are anatomically fruit eaters. Not everyone will admit our lack of claws and fangs and possession of gentle sensitive hands suits us for fruit gathering rather than animal catching. They fail to see that our likeness to fruit-eating creatures places us in the fruit-eating camp. Most people fancy that we're in no animal camp at all—we're humans, gods of a special sort not heir to the principle that apply to animals. They consider us to be not animals at all—just humans!

Aspects of being that disturb most people are best not aroused or discussed. In tutoring people in the ways of health, you must often assume an experienced stance wherein you give guidance. You must exhibit a certainty about the beneficial result that will accrue from the healthful measures you teach. Thus you can adroitly steer clients to our correct dietary and related health practices by tactfully and confidently suggesting a regime that will enable them to become healthy in short order. When it comes

to diet you'll develop your own operating methods for effectively teaching it to others and inspiring them to adopt it.

Let's return to our consideration of humans as meat-eaters. Natural meat eaters have built-in equipment with which to apprehend, capture, kill and rend their quarry. Claws and fangs are very much a part of a carnivore's equipment. Let's consider the human mouth. We couldn't catch an animal in our mouth or dispatch it that way if we tried. Two witnessed dogs catch other animals many times by charging them and snapping their powerful jaws on them at a vital spot. I've seen these dogs sink their fangs deep into the throat of animals must larger than themselves and inflict fatal wounds. A human could not grab an animal in its mouth as does a dog, coyote, wolf or cat. Even biting a live animal with our teeth and mouth opened to the fullest would not permit for the insertion of any animal other than very small ones. And, if the animal was alive, we might have more damage inflicted upon us than we could inflict except with the brute strength of our hands and arms. On the contrary, the human mouth is excellent for biting into fruits or the insertion of fruits and chewing. Obviously we are adapted for eating small items. Lesson Seven has demonstrated that our diet naturally consists of fruits.

The anatomical features that distinguish humans from carnivores such as cats, dogs, eagles, jackals and other carnivorous animals are many. There are few features wherein we are alike. Humans are also very dissimilar to omnivorous animals such as hogs, bears, and the like. Almost everything about these animals is different from humans.

We are also very dissimilar anatomically to grass-eaters. We all know we are not grass-eaters. We reject the idea of eating grass and weeds, the natural dietary of cattle and other herbivora. It's completely contrary to our nature to do so. Eating animal carcasses in their freshly killed or putrefied state is equally contrary to our nature. Psychologically, such actions do not appeal to us. Practically, such a way of life is impossible. We are unique as humans. Nevertheless, we are remarkably like apes in our anatomical features and our physiological processes. Apes are primarily fruit-eaters. Could it not be that we are similarly developed because of similar dietary adaptations? Do not dietary adaptations, more than anything else, determine the features and characteristics of all creatures? Are humans really an exception?

Keep in mind that our mental disposition matches our anatomical and physiological disposition. What we admire naturally (as contrary to acquired perversions) is in accord with our dietary. Our aesthetic standards attribute beauty to fruit trees, and fruit but not to dying and bleeding animals. We savor fruit and are repulsed by blood. We do not savor grass or insects.

Probing this subject narrows our natural dietary down to fruits. In ascertaining our natural dietary you must envision us in a state of nature. Cookstoves were not furnished as part of our natural equipment!

Neither were the many tools and devices we now use. We were once like the apes today—tree-dwellers who lived upon the fruit of the trees, namely fruits and nuts. We functioned totally with our natural equipment for acquiring and eating foods.

Most of the anatomical features that differentiate us from carnivores, omnivores and herbivores have little meaning to people who have been steeped in meat-eating, as most Americans have been. But it takes on meaning when we can relate it to our attitude to. meat-eating on the natural level. Most people cannot stomach the idea of eating animals in the way that natural carrion-eaters do. The idea of raw blood, offal, bones and flesh is repulsive, especially if the eater must apprehend, capture and rend the flesh.

Simple facts about our physiology may impress people who suffer the results of meat-eating. For instance, osteoporosis, which nearly 100% of Americans suffer in some form, may be due in large part to meat-eating. The body must draw base minerals from bones and teeth with which to neutralize the acid end-products of meat-eating.

One of the most telling facts is rather simple. About 5% of the flesh volume of all animals consists of waste materials that are normally eliminated by the kidneys—uric acid, a precursor to urine. Uric acid is

a poison to humans, not only because it is a toxic waste product but because it is non-metabolizable.

All carnivorous animals secrete the enzyme uricase. Uricase breaks down uric acid so that it can be eliminated quite readily. Unfortunately, humans absorb uric acid when meat is eaten. The uric acid stimulates the body like caffeine or other drugs until the body neutralizes it by drawing upon alkaline reserves. In the absence of such reserves, the body draws upon bones and teeth.

What happens to the calcium urate crystals that are formed as a result of this neutralization? For the most part, the body excretes them. Inasmuch as they're in the circulating media of blood and lymph, the body does not eliminate them with dispatch, especially in view of the enormity of the eliminative tasks of most people. Hence the body "buries" the crystals "under the rug," that is, it shunts them aside to areas in which they do the least physiological harm. The body has a tendency to concentrate neutralized uric acid as calcium urates in the joints, lower back and the feet. These deposits lead to arthritis, bursitis, lower back pains, gout, rheumatism, etc. Once an arthritic sufferer recognizes this bodily process as the cause of his suffering, he is usually quite willing to give up meat-eating. Fasting will, in most cases, enable the body to slowly autolyze these deposits and return to normal. A proper diet will not cause such a condition in the first place nor after correction has been realized.

All transgressions of our natural diet have pathological results whether evident or not. The body functions perfectly within the context of its natural dietary and other healthful practices.

Be forewarned that many people are difficult to persuade. They will not believe you against all the dead weight of habituation and wrong practices. But our natural dietary is not a matter of belief. It is a matter of knowledge—of being armed with the truth about our dietary character. This lesson and the next will yield many nuggets with which you can arm yourself.

2. Necessity Of Different Approaches To Nutritional Science

These classes in nutritional science will approach the subject from many interesting aspects. The aim is to make you an expert in matters of nutrition. This involves a great depth of understanding as well as knowledge. This lesson will endeavor to supply both understanding and knowledge.

3. Understanding The Role Of Foods In Nutrition

In understanding the role foods play in the nutritive processes we must establish criteria for the efficiency with which we can handle different types of foods and the needs they meet. To simplify your understanding of the value different foods have, we have signed numerical ratings to the various food properties, mastering an understanding of the properties of foods that make them proper raw materials for our bodies we so easily gain the knowledge we need for nutritional expertise.

I could tell you that by weight of intake, we should eat 97% luscious ripe fruits (including tomatoes,

peppers, cumbers and avocados), 1% nuts (which are also fruits) and 2% vegetables (leaves, stems and stalks). Then I could say that is all that you need to know about our dietary. In truth that statement does effectively summarize our dietary. However, you'll still be learning about the intricacies and subtleties of diet and human nutrition long after having completed this course and having studied such conventional and unconventional literature on the subject. Nutrition is still a formative and exploratory science.

With this lesson we're going to approach the subject in such a way that we can utilize a rating chart and determine whether a food is good or poor in the diet, and readily determine why it is a good or poor food.

Naturally these things are based very much on subjective experience. They are also based on studies and familiarity with the experience of others as well as on the infant science of nutrition.

You will not have to look very closely to see that those foods which our other lessons have pointed out as those of biological adaptation receive the very highest ratings, being, quite literally, perfect foods. The criteria which foods must meet to be beneficial in human dietary include the food's edibility, aesthetic and physiological conditions, and nutritive factors.

4. Edibility Of Foods

4.1 Negative Considerations

Foods that contain antivital or harmful factors will be rated according to our body's ability to deal with these factors. These factors merit minus ratings on the charts. Obviously, we eat for nutriment and not for poisons. The degree of toxicity is thus rated.

4.2 Aesthetic Considerations

Any food must be relished by the unperverted palate in its natural, raw or living state just as Nature delivers it to us. In Nature we were developed on and thus adapted to a totally living food diet. It is imperative that we observe our adaptations. While we will consider some foods in a cooked state as notated on the listings, the rating reflects the lower nutritive values of cooked foods accordingly.

Delectability of food is also a good guide to its value in human nutrition. We must be able to eat our fill of any single food—to make a meal of the item in and of itself for its own sake—if it is to be considered a proper food in our dietary. Palatability or deliciousness is a very valid guide to a food's fitness. Foods should be a gustatory delight. We call this quality "taste appeal."

4.3 Physiological Considerations

In considering the physiological aspects of food digestion, we must consider two factors: the ease and efficiency of digestion. Ease of digestion refers to the ease with which the body handles a given food without pathogenic factors setting in. Efficiency of digestion means how well the body system obtains its needs from a given food relative to the energy it must expend to obtain its needs. For example, the body easily processes vegetables but does not efficiently make use of their nutritive content.

4.4 Nutritional Factors

The nutrient complement of the food is rated according to how well it furnishes our needs, not according only to its amount of nutrients. The nutrient complement we have considered includes all nutrients except fuel values. The nutrients considered, which are proteins, vitamins, mineral salts and essential fatty acids, are given four categories.

For the purposes of rating, each category is given equal value. I am the first to admit this is an arbitrary system. This system is not reflective of the respective values of the nutrients in any absolute sense.

1. Protein Adequacy. Protein sufficiency is not determined only by what the food contains. Rather it is determined by the ability of the body to digest and make use of the food's protein complement relative to our needs.
2. Vitamin adequacy of a given food is determined by our body's ability to assimilate its needs from that food.
3. Mineral salts are another vital component of foods. We have rated foods for this component based upon each food's content of usable mineral salts. Minerals in a native or inorganic form, rather than being a nutrient, are antivital or toxic to the body. Most stems, stalks and leaves hold some amount of unprocessed mineralized water. These waters are usually heavy in inorganic calcium, phosphates, potassium, magnesium, and other minerals. Without plant elaboration we cannot use these minerals. Instead, they contribute heavily to atherosclerosis and ossification.
4. Essential fatty acids are necessary in the nutrient complement of our diet but need not be in every food. Nevertheless we rate each food for its content of these acids. The three most important essential fatty acids are linoleic, linolenic and arachidonic.
5. Fuel value is perhaps the single most important consideration of a wholesome food. This is because about 95% of our food intake is utilized for "stoking our furnaces" with the fuel required for the body's energy. Thus, in this criterion, we are concerned with the net gain of energy from a given food in the quantities we can and would eat of it in a mono meal.

5. Other Food Qualities

There are other factors that we could consider in determining suitability of foods in human alimentation. One significant factor is the role of foods in maintaining body pH. Some foods are alkaline-forming (acid-binding) and others are acid-forming in metabolism. Acid-forming foods place a heavy burden on the body. Humans require a diet preponderately of foods that are alkaline-forming in their metabolic reaction.

Let's review the criteria for rating the value of foods. This time we'll append the rating values for foods based on their usefulness in the human dietary.

Water content of foods, while important, does not enter into rating value. We are not natural water drinkers. Water has a neutral value. Nevertheless, most proper foods possess water sufficient to meet our needs. Nuts, seeds and dried fruits are exceptions to this rule. All meals eaten should consist of such foods as will render them water sufficient. Our water needs are ideally supplied by our diet.

6. Summary Of Criteria Relative To Goodness

We have not given any weight to these considerations because the value of a food in the human nutritive processes is not determined by this factor. Because other factors considered herein are congruous to their goodness (alkalinity) or badness (acidity) we have let these other considerations stand.

There are many valuable nutrients in acid-forming foods, particularly in nuts. Conversely, there are many alkaline-forming foods that are of little use in the human diet. Therefore this criterion is ignored in our deliberations and ratings.

Let's review the criteria for rating the value of foods. This time we'll append the rating values for foods based on their usefulness in the human dietary.

ENTRY NUMBER	CONSIDERATION	RATING VALUE
1.	TOXICITY	Minus (-)0 to 100
2.	EDIBILITY IN THE RAW STATE	Plus 0 to 10
3.	TASTE APPEAL (Deliciousness)	Plus 0 to 10
4.	EASE OF DIGESTION	Plus 0 to 10
5.	EFFICIENCY OF DIGESTION	Plus 0 to 10
6.	PROTEIN ADEQUACY	Plus 0 to 5
7.	VITAMIN ADEQUACY	Plus 0 to 5
8.	MINERAL SALTS ADEQUACY	Plus 0 to 5
9.	ESSENTIAL FATTY ACIDS	Plus 0 to 5
10.	FUEL VALUE	Plus 0 to 40

7. Ratings Of Generally Available Foods

NAME OF FOOD	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	TOTAL RATING
ALMOND	-10	8	5	5	4	10	5	5	5	40	77
APPLE	0	10	10	10	10	3	5	4	3	40	95
APRICOT	0	10	10	10	10	5	5	5	3	40	98
ASPARAGUS	-20	3	3	6	3	5	5	5	3	0	13
AVOCADO	0	10	8	8	7	5	5	5	5	40	93
BANANA	0	10	10	10	10	5	5	5	5	40	100
BARLEY (cooked)	-35	0	5	4	5	3	2	2	3	40	29
BEAN, Green	,5	3	3	7	3	5	5	5	5	15	46
BEAN, Sprouted	-5	3	3	7	3	5	5	5	5	20	51
BEAN, Dried, Cooked	-40	0	5	2	3	5	2	2	5	35	19
BEET, Raw	-20	3	2	4	4	5	5	5	1	5	14
BEET GREENS	-40	2	1	3	3	5	5	5	3	0	-13
BERRIES w/seeds Generally	0	10	8	10	10	5	5	5	5	35	93
BRAZIL NUT	-5	10	5	6	6	5	3	5	5	40	80
BROCCOLI	-5	10	5	7	6	5	5	5	5	10	53
BRUSSELS SPROUTS	-10	10	3	5	4	5	5	5	4	0	31
CABBAGE, Common	-10	10	3	6	4	5	5	5	3	0	31

CANTALOUPE	0	10	10	10	10	5	5	5	3	40	98
CARROT	-5	10	5	7	6	5	5	5	3	30	71
CASHEW (Slightly heated)	-20	5	8	5	6	5	3	5	5	40	62
CAULIFLOWER	-5	10	4	6	5	5	5	5	3	15	53
CELERY	-5	10	5	7	1 5	5	4	5	1	0	36
CHARD, SWISS	-40	2	2	4	3	5	5	5	4	0	-10
CHERIMOYA	0	10	10	10	10	5	4	5	4	40	98
CHERRY, Sweet	0	10	10	10	10	5	5	5	4	40	99
COCONUT (Hardened)	-10	6	4	4	5	5	3	5	5	40	67
COLLARD GREENS	-5	7	4	6	7	5	5	5	5	0	39
CORN, Fresh Sweet	0	10	5	9	9	5	5	5	5	40	93
CUCUMBER	0	10	5	6	6	5	5	5	3	5	50
DANDELION	-40	10	1	3	4	5	5	5	5	0	-2
DATE	0	10	10	10	10	4	3	5	3	40	95
EGGPLANT	-15	10	2	6	5	5	3	5	3	5	29
EGGPLANT, Steamed	-15	0	6	4	3	3	2	3	3	5	14
FIG	0	10	10	10	10	5	4	5	5	40	99
FIG, Dried	0	10	10	10	10	5	2	4	5	40	96
FILBERT (Hazel Nut)	-5	10	6	6	5	5	3	5	5	40	80
GARLIC	-80	0	0	0	2	3	1	3	1	0	-70
GRAPEFRUIT	0	10	9	10	10	3	5	4	2	25	78

GRAPES, Generally	0	10	10	10	10	5	4	4	4	40	97
KALE	-5	10	5	7	7	5	5	5	5	0	44
LETTUCE, Leaf	-5	10	7	8	8	5	5	5	3	0	46
LETTUCE, Iceberg	-5	10	6	7	5	4	5	4	1	0	37
MANGO	0	10	10	10	10	4	5	3	5	40	97
MELONS (See Cantaloupe and Watermelon)											
MILLET, Steamed	-10	0	4	6	7	4	2	3	4	40	60
OKRA	-10	7	5	5	6	5	5	5	5	20	53
ONION	-60	0	0	3	4	5	2	3	1	10	-32
ONION, Cooked	-40	0	5	2	4	3	1	2	0	10	-13
ORANGE, Pulp	0	10	10	10	1.0	5	5	5	2	40	97
PAPAYA	0	10	10	10	10	4	5	4	2	40	95
PEA, Sweet Fresh	0	10	7	9	1 9	4	5	5	4	40	93
PEACH	0	10	10	10	10	4	5	4	2	40	95
PEANUT	-30	7	4	2	4	3	2	5	5	40	42
PEAR	0	10	10	10	10	3	4	3	4	40	94
PECAN	0	10	7	7	5	5	3	5	5	40	87
PEPITAS (Pumpkin and Squash Seeds)	0	10	6	5	5	5	3	5	5	40	84
PEPPER, Sweet	0	10	6	7	8	5	5	4	4	10	59
PERSIMMON	0	10	10	10	10	4	5	4	4	40 .	97
PINEAPPLE	0	10	10	10	10	2	4	3	4	40	93

PLUM	0	10	10	10	10	3	4	3	3	35	88
POPCORN, Dry Popped	-20	0	5	8	8	2	1	3	1	40	48
POTATO, Irish	-10	0	0	2	3	3	5	5	3	20	21
POTATO, Irish, Steamed	-20	0	5	6	7	3	3	4	2	40	50
POTATO, Sweet	0	5	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	40	78
RICE, Brown, Steamed	-20	0	4	5	6	1	1	2	2	40	41
RUTABAGA, Peeled	0	6	4	5	6	5	5	5	2	25	63
SESAME SEEDS	0	8	4	6	4	5	3	5	5	40	80
SPINACH, Raw	-30	7	3	5	7	5	5	5	5	0	2
SPROUTS (Alfalfa, Sunflower)	0	9	5	8	8	5	5	5	5	0	50
SQUASH, Summer Steamed	-20	0	6	6	8	4	3	3	1	20	31
SQUASH, Winter Steamed	-20	0	6	6	8	4	3	3	2	40	52
STRAWBERRY	0	10	10	10	10	4	5	4	5	30	88
SUNFLOWER Seeds	0	8	5	7	7	5	3	5	5	40	85
TANGERINE	0	10	10	10	10	3	5	4	2	40	94
TOMATO	0	10	10	10	10	5	5	5	4	20	94
TOMATO	0	10	10	10	10	5	5	5	4	20	79
TURNIP, Peeled	-10	6	5	5	6	4	4	4	4	20	44
TURNIP GREENS	-30	1	2	3	4	5	5	5	5	0	0
WALNUTS, English	-10	8	6	7	5	5	3	5	5	40	74

WATERMELON	0	10	10	10	10	4	5	4	4	40	97
WHEAT	-30	0	0	1	2	5	2	5	5	20	5
WHEAT, Cooked lightly	-40	0	5	4	5	3	1	3	5	40	26
BREAD, White	-60	0	6	3	3	1	0	1	1	40	-5
EGGS, Cooked	-40	0	2	2	3	3	1	3	1	40	15
HONEY, RAW	-50	10	10	7	6	1	1	1	0	40	16
MEAT, Beef, Cooked	-60	0	0	3	4	4	0	1	1	15	-36
MILK, Pasteurized	-40	0	3	2	3	1	1	3	1	40	14
SALT	-100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-100
SUGAR	-50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	-10

8. Questions & Answers

You have given a very low rating to vegetables and even suggest that we limit our intake to about 2 to 5 %. You've said before we eat vegetables as insurance or protective foods. If they're such good protective foods why not make them half of our food intake? If they really protect us, I think they're good for a bigger share of our dietary intake.

> Vegetables rate much lower since, in examining the charts, it is obvious that they lack many qualities of prime foods. Many vegetables have some toxic factors. They are not savored as are exquisite fruits. They are not digested with the ease and efficiency of fruits. They furnish us no energy at all in most cases. Some actually use more of our energy to process than we can get from them! I calculate that 90% of our eating should be involved in obtaining fuel values. The other 10% should be in association and would be proteins, fat, and minerals with vitamins and other food factors included. Foods such as vegetables fail to furnish caloric values. Nutrient insurance s all they can possibly furnish. Even in this consideration, we really don't need them.

You equate protein with vitamins, minerals and fatty acids. Isn't protein more important than that?

Proteins are the building stones of all living beings. They compose some part of every living cell, fruits included. Yet protein is not more important than other food factors that we ingest, neither relatively nor absolutely, infants thrive on mothers milk which is about 1.2% protein. As long as we get that amount of protein with all essential amino acids amply represented, we're getting as much as we need.

I don't think we need as much protein as a growing baby. If we get 1% protein from a diet that averages seven pounds of food a day we'll be getting 32 grams of protein, though this represents about 50% less than the U.S. RDA, it is still more than a healthy body can make use of. It is wise to point out that the body is capable of meeting about 70% of its protein needs by recycling its own protein wastes. There are thriving pockets of people in the Caribbean who are superb specimens of healthy humans lat have an intake of only 15 to 20 grams of protein daily.

What should we do if a client comes to us who is overly thin and on a protein-deficient diet?

In the field of practice, you'll have many clients that are deficient in many ways, proteins included. One person can have a well rounded diet on a single food and get all he or she needs of every food factor. Another person might subsist on a diet which supplies four or five times our protein needs but, if the diet is cooked or fed to a metabolic cripple, the protein may be largely unavailable. You will not be dealing with deficiencies, per se. In most cases where there are some body reserves you'll advise the client to fast as long as indicated and then realiment the client on a diet of proper foods prepared and served in a manner we have taught you to observe. Your clients' bodies are their sole remedial means. If the conditions for healing and regeneration are established, you must leave them entirely alone. Anything other than this practice will constitute interference. Protein deficiencies are not nearly as likely as other deficiencies and none of these are as likely as toxemia. Toxemia will be the condition of nearly every client you'll get.

How do you determine which nutritive factors a client is deficient in? If most Americans are sick in some way and malnourished, how would I tell what is wrong or what the deficiency is?

In view of my previous response I think the question should be declared already answered. But I bid you, as professional health practitioners, not to get into diagnosing. You don't have to know, in most cases, the particulars of a client's deficiencies. These deficiencies may actually be the result of chronic toxemia that has lowered the person's capacity for assimilation and utilization of foods. If the client is thin, start him out on a diet of easily digested fruits, especially melons, oranges, grapes and other succulent fruit fare. A mono diet of a single fruit would be in order, or at the very least, mono meals. A simple diet of proper foods will give the body some surcease and enable it to purify itself of its toxic burden and to repair damage and rebuild tissues. Don't expect instant results or miracles, because it's often a slow process. The client should take little food while in the eliminative state. When hunger increases, the diet should have its caloric values increased by greater intake or by more concentrated foods such as bananas, figs, dates, or raisins.

Should a client have reserves of fat, and most of your clients will be either normal or overweight, induce them to undertake a fast so the body can eject its toxic load with more facility. Then, after an appropriate period of fasting, start feeding them on a small amount of a single fruit and increase that as indicated.

You'll learn more about these methods in our lessons on fasting as a part of nutrition. Further, you'll learn that your response to all deficiencies, illnesses, and morbid blood and tissues will be much the same. You'll vary your guidance and establish healthful conditions

for your client in accord with his physiological circumstances. The variations will be very few. Just a few patterns will emerge that you can master thoroughly.

You've got a great idea about rating foods as you have. But you give some very low ratings to some good things, especially to lettuce and celery, which you praise so much. Below what rating would you refuse to eat a given food?

Keep in mind that this chart is primarily intended to appraise the value of a food in the human diet on its merits when eaten alone. There are some fine complementary foods such as lettuce and celery that may be added to other foods to achieve certain nutritional objectives. For instance, when lettuce and celery are added to an apple meal, the combination supplies needed additional protein and mineral salts. These two vegetables do not interfere significantly in the digestion of many fruits. Ideally, we should eat primarily foods of the highest rating with some secondarily-rated food. A few nuts should be eaten on occasion. The avocado is a fruit of nut-like consistency that is extraordinarily wholesome. I would say that I would refuse to eat anything rated below 30 and I would not eat higher-rated cooked items. Further, I would be cautious about eating some highly rated foods that had toxic materials in them. This especially applies to cooked foods where an inorganic mineral complement has been created, and where food derangements have taken place that will give the body digestive problems additional to those encountered in the finest foods.

I'd like to know more about the unprocessed mineralized water in vegetables. Why is this so harmful?

Our bodies cannot use inorganic minerals. The body treats inorganic minerals as poisons and utilizes its energies in trying to expel them. Whether the raw minerals come from hard water, from fresh leaves, stems and stalks or from the by-products of cooking decomposition, the body cannot use them. Instead, they create an eliminative problem. If uneliminated these minerals are likely to combine with fatty substances and harden, thus ossifying the brain and clogging arteries and veins. It is said that herbivores are short-lived because of the abundance of inorganic minerals in their food.

What do you have against spinach to rate it so low? I'd rather eat raw spinach than a cooked potato, which you rate much higher.

Spinach contains oxalic acid and unprocessed raw minerals, like all other leaves. Fruits, on the other hand, have pure water — they are finished products. Oxalic acid cannot be metabolized with any degree of facility by the body. To neutralize it, the body draws upon calcium supplies, even calcium from the bones if necessary. Oxalic acid gives a peculiar taste that is readily recognized. I know of no normal palate that can abide it. The calcium of spinach is more than offset by its oxalic acid content. Spinach is not a food you can live on. You'd have a calorie deficit with every meal of it. If a few leaves of it were added to a salad or to some starch, fat or protein meal, there is little to object to.

Dr. William Howard Hay said all diseases are the result of acid-alkaline imbalance. Why don't you tell us which foods are acid-forming and which are acid-binding? Think how important that is if a client is suffering acidosis.

If a client suffered true acidosis he would be dead. Over-acidity is readily corrected by fasting or by a simple diet of mono fruit meals. Causes of acid-alkaline imbalance are eating foods that are predominantly acid-forming, notably cereal foods, meats, dairy and poultry products, seafood and even nuts.

Within a day or two of going on a proper diet, the acidotic condition is corrected. Celery

happens to be a heavily alkaline food that helps a lot. So, too, are figs which are rich in alkaline salts. The worst thing that can happen is to use drugs or antacids. This does not solve the problem. While relief may ensue, the cause, an acid-forming diet, yet remains. Fruits and vegetables quickly establish an alkaline balance.

I've heard so much about how important salt is in the diet. You give it all zeros and give it a minus 100. Does this apply to sea salt or vegetable salts too?

You can readily determine just how important salt is in the diet when you see physicians in this country putting hundreds of thousands on salt-free diets. If salt were essential, no one could do without it. Salt is not digestible or usable. It stays in our bodies until we can in some way eliminate it. The body takes on extra water to hold it in suspension so it offers less harm to cells. It deserves all zeros for, in addition to rating all zeros, it has harmful effects that create disease, notably congestion, high blood pressure, edema and other conditions that earn it a big minus rating.

Sea salt is equally as poisonous as the refined variety. It is extracted from sea water and, in addition to salt, it contains other minerals that are in an inorganic and unusable state. As you perhaps know, sailors prefer death through dehydration rather than death from drinking sea water.

Vegetable salts are dehydrated vegetables that are ground up and are often mixed with additional salt. These are also unwholesome in the diet.

You gave honey a good rating in every department except nutrient content and toxicity. Why did you do this?

The bee laces its honey with several acids, some for which only the bee has enzymes for reconversion. Such acids are poisonous to bacteria and humans alike. That's one of the bee's ways of preserving its food supply. Those acids earn the toxicity rating even though, of its six acids, about half are metabolizable. If you tried to make a meal of honey only, you'd find it tasty and fully calorie sufficient. But you'd probably get a bellyache unlike any you've ever had in your life. You would probably get other problems too. Honey is very poor in nutrients right down the line. It has practically no protein, vitamins, minerals or essential fatty acids. Only the pollen that is incidentally in the honey has any appreciable amount of nutrients. Honey is, literally, sugar water the bee has obtained from flowers as its reward for performing a service. The sugars in honey are primarily levulose and fructose. The bee dehydrates and thus concentrates them. Honey is developed by bees for bees. Nature did not make us dependent upon the industriousness of bees for our sustenance.

I love turnip greens in my salad. You have given them a zero rating in the diet, which means they're worthless. How do you come to that? There are some northern peoples, especially in Northern Europe, who practically live on turnip greens and turnips.

Turnip greens will not long sustain life. They are one of the richest green leaves in nutrients, yet they furnish no calories. Further, they contain unprocessed mineral water and mustard oil that makes them toxic in the diet. Turnips have relatively little mustard oil and are rather wholesome in the diet. They contain a complex sugar instead of starch as their fuel component. A meal can be made of turnips and relative good health will result compared to a conventional diet. Yet by no means are they an excellent food. There are many other foods that are better.

You gave oranges a nearly perfect rating. As far as I know, oranges are a high water content, low

calorie food. How many oranges would you have to eat a day to live on them?

That is a most appropriate question since we have rated this as a food you could fare well on in and of itself. To illustrate this point, a Florida man lived on oranges and only on oranges without ill effect for six years. In fact he was described as being robust in health all the while. The weight of the oranges you should consume to sustain yourself would have to be about 10 pounds of peeled oranges daily. That is about 20 oranges. That would give you 2,250 calories, 45 grams of protein, 1800 milligrams of calcium, 2,250 milligrams of vitamin C, 9 grams of fats, 18 milligrams of iron—in short, a surfeit of all our needed nutrients. As a great lover of oranges I can't consider such a diet as being unpleasant. I've consumed a mono diet of oranges myself for periods of up to two weeks and find them a most excellent food. I was coming off a fast at the time and gained almost ten pounds of weight on them.

How can you rate fruits so high when it is aid we can't get enough protein, calcium or iron out of them?

I think I just indicated the falsity of your statement by citing oranges as being more than replete with the nutrient needs of life. Oranges furnish about twice our real protein needs, ten times our iron needs, about 100 times our real Vitamin C needs, and about 9 times our calcium needs. Keep in mind that the Recommended Daily Allowance is usually from 100% to 500% higher than our real needs in a healthy condition. Almost any fruit you can name, when eaten in an amount sufficient to supply your caloric needs, also supplies you amply with other nutrient needs.

That is surprising, but my question is along the same lines. Why do you give the same fuel value rating to dates and watermelons? According to my food composition handbook, a 100 gram serving of dates has 274 calories and a 100 gram portion of watermelon contains only 26 calories. How can a 90% difference end up with the same fuel value rating? Also, this same book shows turnip greens as having 28 calories per 100 gram serving, more than watermelon, yet you give turnip greens a zero fuel value rating. Can you explain these discrepancies?

There are reasons that our ratings are more or less correct despite these apparent discrepancies.

Keep in mind that water is a neutral factor in foods. If you took all the water out of watermelon, 100 grams of its residue would contain about 340 calories. This corresponds to the caloric content of 100 grams of dates without water content. Watermelon has about 13 parts water for each part of solid. Five pounds of watermelon contains about 600 calories, which is about the same as eight ounces of dates. Both would be considered ample servings.

In the summer you need more water and less calories. Watermelon fills the bill well in that regard. In the winter, you need more calories and less water. Dates are a valuable addition to the diet at that time.

Turnip greens occasion the use of more body energy in processing and expelling than can be appropriated from them. Most of their calories are in cellulose. True, they yield 28 calories of heat when burned in a firebox. Humans can't get all of that energy out of turnip greens. Watermelon, on the other hand, is composed of simple sugars which we can make 100% use of. There is a greater than 900% energy gain over the energy expended in digestion and appropriation of watermelon.

I hope this response clears up the seeming discrepancies in our ratings chart.

How would you rate brewers yeast as a food?

I'd rate it below zero. It loses out on every count, even though it has lots of protein and nutrients. Unless disguised, brewer's yeast is repulsive stuff. Even if disguised, it is indigestible. When we eat brewer's yeast, bacteria decompose it resulting in the formation of gases and poisonous by-products of protein decomposition. Your urine will turn yellow within an hour of taking it, showing that it has been excreted rather than digested and used. Because it is not digested, it can furnish no nutrients. It gives, instead, drug effects which many mistake for nutrient effects. Keep your clients off this junk the brewers industry has foisted off on health seekers as a food.

Dr. Airola says that garlic is a real miracle food with great healing properties. Many other health authorities say the same thing. You classify it as very toxic from the beginning. In fact you give it ten rating points as a food and 80 demerit points as a poison! Who am I to believe, you or Dr. Airola? He's a well known authority on nutrition and, until my introduction here, I'd never heard of you. I've always heard garlic is a wonderful medicinal food, not a poison. It is usually recommended as one of the first foods to add to the diets of sick people. Can you justify your stand?

I imagine Copernicus had an extremly hard time about his concept that the world was round in an age when all the authorities said it was flat and when everyone believed it was flat. But we know valuable truths arise first in the minds of a few and gradually spread to the masses.

Garlic is treasured for its drug effects, not its nutritional effects. It contains two potent poisons, mustard oil and allicin. These poisons earn garlic its minus rating.

As a food, I doubt that anyone can manage to eat a single bulb of garlic by itself. Consider garlic as a food in itself. If you tried to eat enough to obtain the fuel values you needed, presuming of course an amount of garlic was eaten to represent our caloric needs, you'd probably not survive the ordeal!
When anyone praises the medicinal value of something, they're talking about drug effects, not nutritional effects. It is absurd to speak of anything as having healing properties. Healing is totally, exclusively and only a faculty of the organism and belongs to absolutely nothing outside of the organism. Dr. Airola is praising a drug as a food and in matters of healing, does not seem to understand physiology.

I would advise you to believe no one. Investigate matters for yourself. To believe is to be credulous. To know is to be virtuous. Learn the "nitty-gritty" of everything. Don't rely on so-called authorities. Remember, every wrong system of the past and present had and has its authorities. Don't trade on authority. Trade only on the truth you can ascertain.

I don't ask you to believe me. I ask you to examine everything I say and question it just as you are now doing. Put everything to the test. You'll betray the trust of your clients if you guide them wrongly. Learn the truth so that you may truly help them.

Isn't it possible, in view of our knowledge of nutrients and tasty natural foods that combine well, that we can create meals far more wholesome and delicious than just any single food item? For instance, an avocado with greens and tomatoes really tastes great and gives us a complete range of our needs.

Yes, we can construct meals. The rating charts are based on the outlook that, in nature, we were adapted to certain fare and that we ate primarily or only of that fare during its season as is the case with present day animals. But the fact that we can construct well-rounded meals

does not mean they are more wholesome than a single food with a high rating. The meal you suggest is an excellent one. However I would advise not to eat an oil/protein salad meal such as you suggested more often than once every other day. The body is very provident and conserving. It's a lot wiser than our wildest imaginations can lead us to contemplate. For instance, if you're having steamed potatoes, then the addition of such auxiliary fare as cucumbers, bell peppers, broccoli, lettuce, and celery is judicious. If you're having nuts or avocadoes the addition of the same salad fare plus tomatoes is also justified. Our bodies usually handle vegetable fare rather easily. Yet our bodies are inefficient at getting much food value from vegetables other than a goodly part of their rich nutrient load.

Isn't it unhealthy to eat only one food at a meal? The law of the minimum says we must get all our nutritional needs in each meal for that meat to do us good. Why not balance out every meal as recognized nutritionists recommend?

I assure you that our "recognized" nutritionists are about as far off in this matter as in the foods they're placing their stamp of approval on in America today. I presume you've heard of Dr. Frederic Stare who chairs the department of nutrition at Harvard. He claims we should eat for enjoyment. He says such a practice is the healthiest thing to do, and has renamed junk foods joy foods. I hope you aren't giving credence to these "recognized" nutritionists who're busily engaged in selling our health down the river—for a price of course.

The balanced meal concept is based on ignorance and assumptions. The law of the minimum has nothing to do with what we eat at a given meal. I repeat that the body is immensely wise, provident and conservative. Did you know that about 95% of our iron needs can be met from recycled iron? That about 70% of our protein needs can be met from recycled proteins? That the body, contrary to what nutritionists tell you, maintains amino acid pools? That, contrary to what we're told, it stores vitamin C in the adrenales? That the body carries about a five year supply of Vitamin B-12 and receives its supply from bacterial activity in the lower intestine just as is the case with other animals? The law of the minimum applies to the least available needed nutrient at time of synthesis.

When you recognize these factors you begin to realize that the balanced meal concept is incorrect and unnecessary. It gets us into eating protein/carbohydrate/oil and other incompatible combinations at the same meal. Instead of getting a "balanced" meal we get an indigestible mess. In fact, about half of America's meals end up with some degree of indigestion, from mild to severe. That's why the makers of antacids are so many and so rich that they can advertise widely on TV, radio and in other media. If we don't digest our meals, it should be obvious we're not going to get the nutrients we need from them either. Obviously the balanced meal concept is a fallacy.

On the other hand, the foods of our adaptation are the building blocks of balanced meals. These foods give us nutrients in proportion to our ability to handle them. Our development in nature has been built around the foods that best serve us. It might be said we adjusted so as to thrive on them. While the proteins, fats and starches as may exist in fruits are, in a sense, incompatible, they are so organized and our adaptations are so tailored that we handle them with ease and efficiency. Thereby we receive their full goodness while getting our primary need, calorie-rich carbohydrates.

If we get less than our needs of a nutrient at one meal, the body's reserves and providence will carry us on stored past surpluses. Until another meal is indulged that again furnishes us a surfeit of that nutrient, our reserves will cc less, that's all. We'd best eat of foods of our adaptation as do the animals in nature and worry not. That is the message you have to get

across to your clients as well.

Our nutrient needs are much smaller than the world at large wants to admit. This "the more the better" philosophy has sabotaged our collective health. When we get all we need of anything, that is enough. Enough is all we need. Surpluses of proper foods eaten in the regular course will cause problems. If we overeat on wrong foods and foods incompatible with each other we compound the problem immeasurably. Because this is so often the case, it's no wonder that America is such a sick nation! More than 80% of our ill health is attributable to dietary indiscretions. If we corrected our dietary errors alone the health of this country would improve by more than 80%. That's because our dietary fare represents the ever-whelming burden that breaks the camel's back of health, so to speak.

Article #1: Are We Vegetarians Or Fruitarians?

At this point in our study of the character of our natural dietary, I feel it is important to address this question: are we vegetarians or fruitarians? The true answer to this question is extremely important. Nothing could possibly contribute more to your success as a health practitioner than the mastery of the knowledge of our dietary character.

There are about twenty million people in this country who call themselves "vegetarians." Most vegetarians fuel their bodies with what is called vegetarian fare. That is, they fancy themselves as a class of herbivores or plant eaters. We Life Scientists contend that we are not ruminants or herbivores.

Why are we delving into such a narrow-ranged inquiry? There are many amongst us, even those who call themselves Hygienists or Life Scientists, who feel that vegetable fare is proper for humans. If I felt that were true, I would not be pursuing this inquiry. Of course, that does not mean, ipso facto, that I'm right. I will nevertheless endeavor to demonstrate that vegetarian fare lacks the most fundamental requirement for human food and that it fails to meet many necessary criteria to be the basis of the human dietary.

In our life practice and those we endeavor to instill in others, we must strive for dietetic perfection. The best diet, as a component of a well-rounded health regime, will yield the greatest measure of health. From that abundant health springs the greatest joys in life. That which is good is also beautiful. That which is wholesome makes us wonderful for ourselves, for others and for society. An ideal diet is the basis for the best possible level of health. Thus this inquiry is conducted for the purpose of ascertaining what constitutes an ideal diet.

Our natural foods must necessarily appeal to ALL our relevant senses. It follows that our natural foods must delight our eyes, be of a fragrance that tantalizes our olfactory senses, and be of such titillating quality to the taste buds as to be ambrosia. Eating should always be a gustatory delight. Our development in nature was such that discomforts and unpleasantness were never a condition of life. Only when we deviate from our natural adaptations do we suffer. Hence it is a truism that our natural foods are enchanting to the eye, captivating to smell, ecstatically delicious to eat and harmonious in the body. This truism invites comparisons based on sensual' involvement in the selection and consumption of foods.

When we were entirely the children of Nature, we did not have utensils or cookstoves as a part of our

endowment. We had to eat our foods as we found and gathered them in nature. So the ascertainment of the value of foods is necessarily based on the condition in which foods come to us from nature, in their living or raw state, at the peak of perfection. The comparisons I am about to set forth must be valid for you only if they relate to your preferences.

Which would you prefer? The aromatic sweet flesh of a properly ripened pineapple or a head of broccoli? Would you rather have a delectable sun-ripened peach or a few raw collard greens? Would you prefer a stalk of celery or a bunch of purple concord grapes? Which entices you the most, a colorful juicy orange or spinach greens? Does a head of cabbage attract you as much as a properly ripened, brilliantly yellow and brown speckled banana? Which lures your eye most for beauty, a large red delicious apple or a freshly dug carrot? Does a basket of brussels sprouts turn your head as much as a basket of strawberries? Is the heavenly delicacy of a Cornice pear matched by anything you've ever eaten from the lettuce family?

If you've ever eaten a cherimoya, mango, mangosteen, soursop, sapodilla, fig, date, watermelon, cantaloup, honeydew or other mouthwatering delights, you know well their joys. Can you compare the eating of any single vegetable in its raw state to eating any of these heady delights? Can you not see that, in order for a food to be a natural item of human dietary, we must be capable of relishing that food eaten by itself in the raw state?

Not only must the food be a gourmet experience in its living state but our fill of it must furnish us with most if not all our nutrient needs. This is a most vital consideration.

Can you name a single vegetable that you'd ravish, as a full meal of itself in its raw state? Almost any vegetable that you can name fails in the first prerequisite of a food: it must furnish us amply of our fuel requirements. Almost every vegetable you name does not furnish us with any significant amount of caloric values. All green leaves, regardless of their calorie rating, yield us no net increase in calories. The energy of digestion and assimilation often exceed the calories obtained therefrom. Most of the calories of vegetables are bound in indigestible cellulose. Ruminants with four stomachs, true herbivores, can digest cellulose and thereby obtain fuel and nutrient values. We humans become as thin as a rail if we try to sustain ourselves on vegetable fare.

The potato, a tuber, is regarded as a vegetable. If eaten raw, it cannot be relished. Moreover, its starches cannot be utilized for two reasons. First, most of its food values are inaccessible to us because they are encapsulated in cellulose membranes. Secondly, those values which are freed quickly exhaust our supply of the starch-splitting enzyme, ptyalin (salivary amylase).

Cereal gains, which are popularly regarded as vegetables even though they are not, have the same drawbacks in digestion as does the potato. Grains occur in an edible state but a day or two in their cycles. Otherwise they're inedible except upon heavy soaking or sprouting. Even when soaked or sprouted, every grain is deficient in one or several aspects of its nutrient complement. Most also offer digestive problems. The gluten of wheat, for instance, is indigestible. We simply don't possess the enzymes to break it down. Wheat protein is bound as gluten. Further, most grains contain phytic acid, which we cannot handle. They bind calcium and thus rob us of that mineral salt.

An examination of every vegetable reveals it, when it stands on its own, as unsuited for human sustenance in some significant aspect or other. Fruit, on the other hand, supplies us amply with all our needs including proteins, mineral salts, vitamins, fuel and other vital food components, known and unknown.

We can relish fruits in their raw ripe state without any special preparation beyond pitting and/or peeling. I know of very few vegetables that would even begin to furnish our needs amply that we can make a meal of, even if we did relish them. Turnips, rutabagas, kohlrabi, fresh sweet corn, sprouted legumes and fresh sweet peas (where starch has not set) would be some of the near exceptions.

Without cookery and condiments most vegetables are unappealing. We must jazz up their lack of taste appeal with stimulating herbs or unwholesome flavorings, fats, seasonings, etc. We must deceive our

senses in order to consume vegetables. Condiments and cooking are very destructive to our health.

Most vegetarians eat fruits, even a preponderance of fruits, yet call themselves vegetarians. Many vegetarians consume fish, milk and dairy products and eggs and still fancy themselves vegetarians. Of course these products are not even vegetables. Vegetables are plants. But the seeds of plants, the legumes, the grains, certain fruits such as cucumbers, squash, pumpkins, tomatoes, eggplants and peppers are regarded as vegetables though technically they are not.

Not all fruits meet the proper criteria as food for humans. Nuts and avocados are suitable as food but we could not sustain ourselves on them whereas we can sustain ourselves indefinitely on grapes, bananas, oranges, figs, dates and many other fruits. We'd never make it on fruits such as cucumbers, tomatoes, eggplants, peppers and squash any more so than we can make it on cabbage or celery.

A good indication of what our natural foods are can be determined by the natural preferences of a child that has been fed nothing but its mother's milk. Does it like cereals or bananas'? Apples or cabbage? What will a child go for if let to choose its own food? In my experience such a child always has chosen fruits. When served vegetables, my child found them a chore to eat, though he ate them to some extent.

We have considered vegetables and fruits based on aesthetic appeal and fuel requirements. There are other touchstones for consideration which we shall now explore. Humans are classed as frugivora or frugivores or fruit eaters because of their anatomy, their primate character, their digestive faculties, their psychological disposition and their background in nature. Research has shown that we had an arboreal past—that we were once tree dwellers. At that time we depended upon the products of tree, and later upon the fruits of stalk and vine, for our sustenance.

For example, Dr. Alan Walker, an anthropologist of Johns Hopkins University in Maryland, has done research that shows that humans were once exclusively fruit eaters. By careful examination of fossil teeth and fossilized remains of humans with the aid of electron microscopes and other sophisticated tools, Dr. Walker and other researchers are absolutely certain that our ancestors, up to a point in relatively recent history, were total fruitarians. These findings were reported in depth in the May 15, 1979 issue of the New York Times.

These findings complement other findings and verify the consistent scientific classification of humans as frugivora.

Creatures that live in accord with their biological heritage do not develop disease. They live out their normal life spans and die natural deaths. Humans have by and large strayed from their natural dietary and for that reason suffer disease and early death. Humans who undertake to live on their natural dietary and observe other modalities of healthful living also live unto a ripe old age and die a natural death. Although it is a rarity, people who touch base with life's requisites have lived well past 100. In Hunza such a lifespan is a rule rather than the exception, even though their dietary is far from ideal.

Green leaves and stalks contain a greater concentration of vitamins, minerals and other nutrients than fruits. But they also contain, in most cases, compounds we cannot handle well. Lettuce contains minute amounts of a poison called lactucarium, which is a soporific. It is contained in a milk-like substance, just as in the poppy. Large amounts of lactucarium can be gathered and converted to substances resembling opium and heroin.

Celery has bitter properties in the leaves which make them repulsive to the normal palate. Anything that disagrees with our taste buds has, ipso facto, been rejected at that point. That is not to say, on the other side of the ledger, that a pleasant taste is the sole criteria by which to select foods, even with foods as they occur in nature, our taste is the surest guide we have if our taste buds are unperverted.

I deeply believe that we can add certain vegetables to our diet in small quantities with some benefit, most notably lettuce and celery. Their wealth of vitamins and mineral salts as well as their high quality protein amply supplement and insure adequacy of a fruitarian diet. Our bodies handle small amounts of such vegetable fare rather efficiently and without protest. In conjunction with a vegetable meal certain

fruits can also be added, especially bell peppers, tomatoes and avocados. Secondarily we can add nuts on occasion or seeds such as pumpkin, sesame id sunflower. These seeds have the same dietetic character as nuts even though humans probably never ate them in nature.

It is well to always keep in mind that we are not naturally herbivores, graminivores, carnivores, insectivores or omnivores. Neither are we oil, protein or starch eaters except incidentally. Our protein needs are met amply from fruits but the occasional addition of nuts, seeds and greens insures dietary protein adequacy. However, we do not handle concentrated foods containing oil, proteins and arches with any great degree of efficiency. They are best eaten infrequently, perhaps two or three times weekly as Proteins require about 70% as much energy to digest and assimilate as they furnish whereas sweet fruits are so efficiently handled that the body is able to utilize over 90% of their caloric energy after deducting energies expended in ingestion and assimilation. Moreover, proteins are not used for energy as long as carbohydrates and fats are available.

That to which we are physiologically adapted is also most effectively and efficiently utilized. Vegetables, I repeat, yield us no calories as a rule though we do obtain from them a plethora of nutrients. Even so, fresh ripe raw fruits furnish us amply of our needs including proteins, vitamins and mineral salts. Even our very small need for essential fatty acids is well met by fruits. When we meet our requirements, that's enough. Enough is all we need. Oversubscription can be like overloading a truck or a mule—it is very taxing and damaging.

Though vegetables are not natural to our dietary I must reiterate this observation: Not all vegetables are bad in our diet for they are consonant with our needs. On the same order, not all fruits are good for us. Many fruits are poisonous. Some, though not poisonous, are not handled well, such as oily fruits like Brazil nuts and pecans, high protein and fat content nuts and seeds such as almonds and sunflower, and starchy fruits such as pumpkins and chestnuts.

No natural food in the world rivals fruits for exquisiteness and wholesomeness. Inasmuch as tables of composition of foods show fruits replete with our needs, and inasmuch as we can more efficiently make use of the nutrients of fruits than any vegetable, legume or grain, we can safely confine ourselves to completely fruitarian fare with great benefit.

While the condition and quality of fruits available in our marketplaces are lamentable, the same goes for everything else sold as foods! So we are still better off with fruits. Some fine quality fruits can be obtained and we should concentrate upon those. Dried fruits have considerable goodness too. We should complement our fruit meals with some dried fruits, especially if we're in need of high caloric intake.

I believe the points made herein support overwhelmingly that we are fruitarians. Thus I rest my case.

THE CARNIVORA	**THE OMNIVORA**	**THE HERBIVORA**	**THE ANTHROPOID APES**	**MAN**
Zonary placenta	Placenta non-acciduate	Placenta non-deciduate	Discoidal placenta	Discoidal placenta
Four Footed	Four Footed	Four footed	Two hands and two feet	Two hands and two feet
Have claws	Have hoofs	Have hoofs (cloven)	Flat nails	Flat nails
Go on all fours	Go on all fours	Go on all fours	Walks upright	Walks upright

Have tails	Have tails	Have tails	Without tails	Without tails
Eyes look sideways	Eyes look sideways	Eyes look sideways	Eyes look forward	Eyes look forward
Skin without pores	Skin with pores	Skin with pores (save with pachyderms as the elephant	Millions of pores	Millions of pores
Slightly developed incisor teeth	Very well-developed incisor teeth		Well-developed incisor teeth	Well-developed incisor teeth
Pointed molar teeth	Molar teeth in folds		Blunt molar teeth	Blunt molar teeth
*Dental formula 5 to 8.1.6.1.5 to 8 5 to 8.1.6.1.5 to 8	Dental formula 8.1.2 to 3.1.8 8.1.2 to 3.1.8	Dental formula 6.0.0.0.6 6.1.6.1.6	Dental formula 5.1.4.1.5. 5.1.4.1.5.	Dental formula 5.1.4.1.5 5.1.4.1.5
Small salivary glands	Well-developed salivary glands	Well-developed salivary glands	Well-developed salivary glands	Well-developed salivary glands
Acid reaction of saliva and urine	Saliva and urine acid	Alkaline reaction, saliva and urine	Alkaline reaction, saliva and urine	Alkaline reaction of saliva and urine
Rasping tongue	Smooth tongue	Smooth tongue	Smooth tongue	Smooth tongue
Teats on abdomen	Teats on abdomen	Teats on abdomen	Miammary glands on breast	Mammary glands on breast
Stomach simple and roundish	Stomach simple and roundish large cul-de-sac	A stomach in three compartments (in camel and some ruminents four)	Stomach with duodenum (as second stomach)	Stomach with duodenum (as second stomach)
Intestinal canal 3 times length of the body	Intestinal canal 10 times length of the body	Length of intestinal canal varies according to species, but is usually 10 times longer than body	Intestinal canal 12 times length of the body	Intestinal canal 12 times length-of the body
Colon Smooth	Intestinal canal smooth and	Intestinal canal smooth and	Colon convoluted	Colon convoluted

	convoluted	convoluted		
Lives on flesh	Lives on flesh, carrion and plants	Lives on grass, herbs and plants	Lives on fruit and nuts	Lives on fruit and nuts

*The figures in the center represent the number of incisors upon each side

Article #2: Research Yields Bombshell Of A Surprise!

The prestigious New York Times newspaper, in its May 5th issue, surprised your editor more by printing an article than the surprise they express by the findings revealed.

The gist of this article is some research done by an Anthropologist, Dr. Alan Walker of Johns Hopkins University in Maryland.

Dr. Walker has come to the startling conclusion that early humans were fruit eaters—not just fruit eaters but exclusively and only fruit eaters—eaters of nothing but fruit. This comes as quite a bombshell from a noted publication that has a vested interest in a heavy meat-eating society.

By careful examination of fossil teeth and fossilized remains of humans with the aid of electron microscopes and other sophisticated tools, Dr. Walker and other researchers are absolutely certain that our ancestors, up to a point in relatively recent history, were fruitarians.

Hygienists are not necessarily fruitarians but all will tell you that humans are, by physiology and anatomy, Frugivores. A cursory study of biology will reveal this, even if written by meat-eating professors, which most of our Biologists are.

The scope of the article is rather far flung. They trace humans through history as expanding to herbiage and nuts and, finally, to meat as a full-fledged omnivore.

But the essence of the article is that, though we undertook omnivorous eating practices, our anatomy and physiology have not changed—we remain biologically a species of fruit eaters.

Our dietetic character is established by our disposition toward fruits. Our natural diet has great eye and taste appeal. It passes from the stomach in digestible form in from 10 minutes to 30 minutes after ingestion.

Contrast this with concentrated fat and protein foods which take three to five hours to pass out of the stomach.

We do not have the four stomachs that herbivores usually have. This rules out most herbiage.

We have only one starch-splitting enzyme versus a multitude of them in omnivores and starch-eating animals. Our ptyalin is very limited. This rules us out as starch-eaters which includes grains or cereals. We are not graminivores.

Neither are we carnivores. It is repugnant to our thoughts to kill and eat an animal while it is yet warm and bloody, to eat its brains, heart, offal and blood as true carnivores do. True carnivores do not chew meat—they have in their digestive tracts a hydrochloric acid so concentrated, about 1100% more so than ours, that it will digest the flesh from our hands if they swallowed them. But our acids are so weak we

digest meat poorly even if we chew it thoroughly. Even then we cannot handle uric acid except at great expense to our vitality and well-being. Cholesterol plays havoc with our circulatory system. So don't think we're natural meat-eaters. We're suffering very dearly for our dietary indiscretions—America has more sick people than any country in the world.

Can you imagine the dismay with which our meat and dairy industry not to mention our extensive junk food industry will view such damaging propaganda? Can you not see how many advertisers will have second thoughts about placing advertising in the New York Times?

Well, it doesn't quite work like that. The junk food advertising in the New York Times amounts to about nil. It is a newspaper that "prints all the news that's fit to print." It serves a cultured, aware audience.

But one of the surprising things that came out of this article is its attribution of the harmfulness of our shift from our natural diet of fruits to other items of food that range from eggs and insects to milk and meats.

I have checked with many Life Scientists in other areas of the country. Not one has seen nary a mention of these universally significant findings. I've examined our local papers. You'd never know about it. After all, our local papers serve the industries that a general knowledge and observance of these findings would destroy outright.

Most Hygienists/Life Scientists do not make sweet fruits their primary item of diet. Few do. Your editor's diet has been only 70% to 80% fruitarian, perhaps more if you consider nuts, tomatoes, bell peppers, cucumbers, avocados, eggplants, and other such items as fruits, which they are. Then your editor's diet might be considered about 95% fruitarian with the balance being the green leaves and stalks of lettuce, celery, kale, collards, Chinese cabbage, sprouts, broccoli and cauliflowers.

Actually we all naturally have a "sweet tooth" and it is with reference to fruit-eating that we are frugivores.

When I was a youngster I was accused of wanting to eat only desserts and leaving the good substantial food to waste. Now I'm sort of intrigued by all-dessert meals in fact I eat so many of them now I sometimes go days with nothing but. Now that the melon season is upon us plus all the other goodies, I'm afraid my vegetable and nonsweet fruit eating are going to take a back seat. In the mulberry season your editor ate only mulberries for two or three days running on several occasions.

The salutary truths contained in these findings will be hedged by most who learn of it. It will be said that fruits do not supply us with sufficient proteins or nutrients or no longer do. Much will be said but this does not negate the truth. It will all be in defense of wrong learning and wrong notions. Even many Hygienists/Life Scientists will pooh-pooh an all-fruit diet.

If you don't go along with an all fruit diet, then why not add some greens, sprouts, nuts and seeds? But you should make your diet of mostly fruit. You'll attain to a high state of health, mental well-being and functional vigor. If you eat a salad every second and third day with a protein, that's often enough to assure more than adequate nutriment.

Article #3: Are We Meat Eaters?

Almost any argument can be effectively destroyed on the emotional level. When you invoke a picture of realism in the presentation of argument it will either build or destroy your argument. The truth should

win out regardless of what side of an argument you're on.

Hygienists have often been taunted with "I don't want any of your rabbit food." An emotional rejoinder that leaves them agag is "I'd prefer it to your buzzard food."

Some folks will tell you humans are meat-eaters and that they personally are meat-eaters. Of course they're not true carnivores. You can create revulsion in them for meat-eating by simply telling them: "When you can take a live rabbit and crush its head in your mouth, start chewing it up and eat it, hair, skin, bones, brain, gristle, guts and all, then you can tell me you're a meat-eater. Until you can do that with relish, get off your phony argument." That will really floor them.

Another sure argument that will floor your detractors or intellectual protagonists is to ask some pertinent but innocent question. You might ask your meat-eating argumentative friend if he or she secretes uricase. Of course few will know what you're talking about. "Uricase? What's that?" they may ask. You counter, "You don't know what uricase is and you're telling me you're a meat-eater? Uricase is an enzyme that is secreted in the intestinal tract of all carnivorous animals! Humans do not secrete this enzyme. Thus, when humans eat meat they cannot break down toxic uric acid. When uric acid is absorbed it creates havoc in the body. To neutralize uric acid the body must draw upon its reserves of valuable alkaline minerals, especially calcium." Because grain and meat-eating humans have a predominantly acid-forming diet, the body must oftentimes get the necessary base minerals from its bones to neutralize the acids. The resulting calcium urates cause kidney stones, accretions in the joints that result in arthritis and, in all events, osteoporosis of both bones and teeth.

You can thoughtfully adduce many arguments when you are "homed in" on the criteria for our natural diet. For instance, you might ask your detractor to picture a three year old child in a playpen. Into the pen we place a rabbit and an apple. Will the child be hostile to the rabbit, kill and eat it and play with the apple? Or will the child eat the apple, and befriend and play with the rabbit?

It is said there is no winning an argument. "Convinced against his will a man remains of the same opinion still." But, if there are spectators who observe out of interest, the arguments are telling. When eating meat in the future it will be difficult for him or her to eat it without conjuring up the picture of blood, offal, bones, hair, etc.

Article #4: Are We Milk Drinkers?

America's dairy industry has no intention of letting Americans become weaned. We are to remain sucklings all our life.

One of the most telling arguments against milk drinking is to elucidate the realities of milk-drinking. Consider the following statements. Milk would be much fresher and more wholesome if taken directly from the teat of the cow as it is done in nature by calves. The fact that a person suckles vicariously does not make it suckling any the less. It's no different than paying someone to kill your animals for you. When you pay the butcher you pay everyone—and you're a killer by proxy just as much as someone is who buys a contract for someone else's death.

Should anyone argue seriously that milk is the one perfect food you can agree with them that this is true—for a calf. Then you might inquire if their bodies secrete rennin and lactase. These enzymes respectively break down the casein of milk, the calcium/protein component and lactose, the milk sugar. Humans normally cease to secrete these enzymes at about age three, and thereafter can no longer handle

milk. It's no accident that our number one "allergy" is milk. The body properly objects to substances it cannot use for food.

Yes, milk may be the one most perfect food but that does us no good if we can't digest and use it. Further, when our bacterial flora decompose it, fermenting part and putrefying part, the by-products of decomposition will cause many problems we didn't bargain for.

Article #5: Are We Grain Eeaters?

Grains are grass seeds. The grains of today are rather tall, but they're huge compared to the seeds from which they're developed. Grains have been cultivated and eaten humans for only about 8,000 years.

In nature we did not eat grains or grass seeds. We did not develop any gathering or digestive equipment for grains. Natural grain eaters must be able to efficiently gather, grind and digest grains. Humans fail on all counts. Our teeth handle grains poorly. In fact, humans refuse to chew tasteless and hard grains. Even so, humans, not being starch eaters, cannot digest more than a handful of grains, if that much. True starch eaters secrete a plethora of starch-splitting enzymes in copious amounts. Humans secrete one starch-splitting enzyme, salivary amylase (ptyalin) which is quickly exhausted. After a mouthful or two of starch, the eater palls and stops.

Nope, we're not grain eaters. The way we do eat grains by mechanical gathering, refining, cooking, etc. makes them palatable but more pathogenic.